

REMARKS

Claims 1-15 remain in the present application. Independent claims 1 and 12 have been amended.

In the Office Action dated August 26, 2004, the Examiner rejected, in particular, independent claims 1 and 12 of the present application under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Bhatia et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,118,768). For the following reasons, Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejection and respectfully request the withdrawal thereof.

Applicants note that, pursuant to the present amendment, independent claims 1 and 12 have been amended so as to clarify that "the information may be transmitted to the router device by an arbitrary device connected to the local computer network, and the information identifies the selected one of the conversion devices." Such elements, however, are not taught or suggested by the Bhatia reference.

Indeed, the Bhatia reference merely discloses a LAN modem having an ISDN router via which a connection is set up to a communication network. Such connection is based on a workstation connected to an Ethernet. Such communication network, in turn, is connected to further networks (e.g., the Internet) via a number of conversion devices (network service provider).

For a selection of a particular network service provider, corresponding bits of information are deposited in the LAN modem for each network service provider (see, for example, Col. 5, line 61 through Col. 6, line 8 of the Bhatia reference). Applicants respectfully submit, however, that such selection of conversion device does not occur based on information which is transmitted to the associated router device by an arbitrary device connected to the local computer network, wherein the information identifies the selected conversion device. Conversely, Bhatia merely teaches that a network service provider be selected on the basis of the origin address and the target address of a data packet received by a transmitting device (see, for example, Col. 30, lines 38-46). Pursuant to the teachings of Bhatia, a network service provider is firmly prescribed in the LAN modem with respect to the devices that are connected to the aforementioned Ethernet. Accordingly, a variable, situation-dependent selection of a network service provider (based on an arbitrary device connected to such Ethernet) simply is not possible in accordance therewith. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that the Bhatia reference does not teach or

suggest, nor even contemplate, the claimed invention wherein information may be transmitted to the router device by an arbitrary device connected to the local computer network, with the information identifying the selected one of the conversion devices.


In light of the above, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1 and 12 of the present application, as well as claims 2-11 and 13-15 which respectfully depend therefrom, are both novel and non-obvious over the art of record. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

It is further acknowledged that a three month extension of time of \$1020.00 is due in connection with this response at this time. However, if any fees are due in connection with this application as a whole, the Examiner is authorized to deduct said fees from Deposit Account No.: 02-1818. If such a deduction is made, please indicate the attorney docket number (0112740-350) on the account statement.

Respectfully submitted,

BELL, BOYD & LLOYD LLC

BY



William E. Vaughan

Reg. No. 39,056

P.O. Box 1135

Chicago, Illinois 60690-1135

Phone: (312) 807-4292

Dated: February 25, 2005